



REMARKS

The final rejection asserts that the claimed limitations are taught. But despite the fact that the office action is some 16 pages in length, not a single supporting citation is provided. Moreover, nothing is pointed to in any cited references to show a teaching of applying a plasticizer to the surface patterned photoresist to decrease line edge roughness as set forth in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that there is simply no support for the rejection. The Patent Office rules require that the support for the rejection be made out in the rejection. Moreover, if the case proceeds to appeal, the Examiner will have to show the claimed elements in the cited material or the rejection will be reversed.


The assertion is made in paragraph 6 under Response to Arguments that "clearly the Hallock reference teaches applying a plasticizer to a resist film and when applied, there would be a coating of that solvent on the resist at least for a short time, thus, the rejection is maintained." It seems like what is being said here is that a solvent and a plasticizer are the same thing. It is not believed that there is any basis for such a conclusion. A solvent simply places something in solution. It has nothing to do with plasticizing.

Further, with respect to the 103 rejection based on three references, it is suggested that the references teach typical plasticizers. However, no citation is provided. No citation is provided to show that any of the cited references teach applying a plasticizer to the surface of the patterned photoresist to decrease line edge roughness and reflowing the photoresist after applying the plasticizer.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 19, 2005



Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation